



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/297,256	04/28/1999	GORAN SUNDHOLM	U012229-2	9504

7590 07/29/2002
LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

KIM, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/297,256

Applicant(s)

SUNDHOLM, GORAN

Examiner

Christopher S. Kim

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 24, 2002 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites "a plurality of drive gas sources". It is uncertain whether the "plurality of drive gas sources" is in addition to the "at least one drive gas source" recited in claim 1. It is uncertain how many drive gas sources are defined by the claimed limitations.

Art Unit: 3752

Claim 4 recites "a drive gas source". This appears to be a double inclusion of the "plurality of drive gas sources" recited in claim 2.

Claim 6 recites "a group of spray heads". This appears to be a double inclusion of the "plurality of spray heads" recited in claim 1.

Claim 6 recites "or sprinklers". The alternative limitation renders the claim indefinite.

Claim 7 recites "release means". This appears to be a double inclusion of the "release means" recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 recites "a drive gas source". This appears to be a double inclusion of the "plurality of drive gas sources" recited in claim 2.

Claim 7 recites "a group of spray heads". This appears to be a double inclusion of the "plurality of spray heads" recited in claim 1 and the "group of spray heads" recited in claim 6.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, it is uncertain whether applicant is claiming the subcombination of a fire fighting apparatus or the combination of a fire fighting apparatus and a tunnel.

Regarding claim 11, the term "mist-like" renders the claim indefinite because the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be determined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naumann (3,613,794).

Art Unit: 3752

Naumann discloses a fire fighting apparatus comprising: a plurality of spray heads 25; a tube system 13; at least one drive gas source 15, 17; and release means 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diquattro (3,012,613) in view of Lockwood (3,827,502).

With respect to claims 1, 11, 13 and 14, Diquattro discloses a fire fighting apparatus comprising: a plurality of spray heads 1-8; a tube system 16a-c, 12, 14, 18; at least one drive gas source 10; a release means 28. Diquattro discloses, in figure 1, by way of example (column 2, lines 40-41), receptacles 16a-c being cylinder-like and varying the size and capacity to meet various combinations of requirements (column 3, lines 48-51). Lockwood teaches a tube shape in figure 1 and a cylinder shape in figure 2 for changing the capacity of extinguishant (column 3, lines 29-32). Lockwood also teaches various lengths of tubing in figures 3-5. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have shaped the receptacles of Diquattro into a tube shape of appropriate length as taught by Lockwood to meet various operating requirements (Diquattro, column 3, lines 50-52).

With respect to claims 2, 4, 6, 7, Diquattro in view of Lockwood discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the plurality of drive gas sources. Providing a plurality of drive gas sources is a mere duplication of parts. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3752

invention to have provided a plurality of drive gas sources in the device of Diquattro in view of Lockwood for redundancy and backup.

With respect to claim 3, Diquattro further discloses a stop/opening valve 15.

With respect to claim 5, Diquattro further discloses, in column 2, lines 26-28, nitrogen at 3000 psi (206.85 bar) as an example of gas in drive gas source 10.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, Diquattro in view of Lockwood discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of a tunnel. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the device of Diquattro in view of Lockwood in a tunnel to prevent fires in a tunnel.

With respect to claim 12, Diquattro in view of Lockwood discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the water-based liquid. Water is well known in the art for use in fire fighting. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used water as coolant in the device of Diquattro in view of Lockwood to reduce cost since water is readily available.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diquattro (3,012,613) in view of Lockwood (3,827,502) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Willms (4,082,148).

Diquattro in view of Lockwood discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the solenoid valve. Willms discloses a fire fighting apparatus with zone 1 and zone 2 each zone having a release means 20, 20A and solenoid valve 17, 17A. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have replaced the release means of Diquattro in the device of

Art Unit: 3752

Diquattro in view of Lockwood with the release means and solenoid valve of Willms to automate the device.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that Naumann does not disclose a tube, although Naumann used the term "container", Naumann's container is tube shaped. Therefore the container of Naumann meets the claimed limitation of a tube.

9. Remainder of applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-8336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry C. Yuen can be reached on (703) 308-1946. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7766 for regular communications and (703) 308-7766 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3752

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



Christopher S. Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 3752

CK
July 25, 2002